



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/680,959	10/04/2000	Glenn Friedrich	LEX-0051-USA	9566

24231 7590 01/30/2003

LEXICON GENETICS INCORPORATED  
8800 TECHNOLOGY FOREST PLACE  
THE WOODLANDS, TX 77381-1160

EXAMINER

TON, THAIAN N

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1632

DATE MAILED: 01/30/2003

13

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/680,959

Applicant(s)

FRIEDRICH ET AL.

Examiner

Thaian N. Ton

Art Unit

1632

-- Th MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11/14/02.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 2) ☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_ 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### DETAILED ACTION

Applicants' amendment, filed 11/14/02, Paper No. 12, has been entered. Claims 1 and 7 have been amended. Claims 1-7 are pending and under current examination.

### *Election/Restrictions*

Applicant's election with traverse of SEQ ID NO: 125 in Paper No. 12 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that all the described mutated cell clones have mutations manifested by the incorporation into the genome of a common genetically engineered construct [see p. 2, 1<sup>st</sup> ¶ of the Response]. This is not found persuasive because each of the SEQ ID numbers represents patentably distinct sequences, as each of the sequences is unrelated, each encodes a different product which differ considerably in structure and function, as well as technical considerations.

MPEP 803.04 states:

Nucleotide sequences encoding different proteins are structurally distinct chemical compounds and are unrelated to one another. These sequences are thus deemed to normally constitute independent and distinct inventions within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. 121. Absent evidence to the contrary, each such nucleotide sequence is presumed to represent an independent and distinct invention, subject to a restriction requirement pursuant to 35 U.S.C. 121 and 37 CFR 1.141 et seq. Nevertheless, to further aid the biotechnology industry in protecting its intellectual property without creating an undue burden on the Office, the Commissioner has decided sua sponte to partially waive the requirements of 37 CFR 1.141 et seq. and permit a reasonable number of such nucleotide sequences to be claimed in a

single application. See Examination of Patent Applications Containing Nucleotide Sequences, 1192 O.G. 68 (November 19, 1996).

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

### *Specification*

A substitute specification is required pursuant to 37 CFR 1.125(a) because the margins of the specification are too small and hole-punching obscures the text.

A substitute specification filed under 37 CFR 1.125(a) must only contain subject matter from the original specification and any previously entered amendment under 37 CFR 1.121. If the substitute specification contains additional subject matter not of record, the substitute specification must be filed under 37 CFR 1.125(b) and must be accompanied by: 1) a statement that the substitute specification contains no new matter; and 2) a marked-up copy showing the amendments to be made via the substitute specification relative to the specification at the time the substitute specification is filed.

The disclosure is objected to because it contains an embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code. Applicant is required to delete the embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code. See MPEP § 608.01. See p. 4, line 29.

### *Drawings*

The drawings are objected for reasons advanced on the Notice of Draftsperson Patent Drawing Review [PTO-948], accompanying this Office action. A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Applicant(s) is/are hereby notified that the required timing for correction of drawings has changed. See the last 6 lines on the sheet, which is attached, entitled "Attachment for PTO-948 (Rev. 03/01 or earlier)". Due to the above notification Applicant(s) is/are required to submit drawing corrections with the time period set for responding to this Office action. Failure to respond to this requirement may result in abandonment of the instant application or a notice of a failure to fully respond to this Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

### *Claim Rejections – 35 USC §101 & 112*

Definitions:

[from REVISED INTERIM UTILITY GUIDELINES TRAINING MATERIALS; repeated from <http://www.uspto.gov/web/menu/utility.pdf>]

Art Unit: 1632

"Credible Utility" - Where an applicant has specifically asserted that an invention has a particular utility, that assertion cannot simply be dismissed by Office personnel as being "wrong". Rather, Office personnel must determine if the assertion of utility is credible (i.e., whether the assertion of utility is believable to a person of ordinary skill in the art based on the totality of evidence and reasoning provided). An assertion is credible unless (A) the logic underlying the assertion is seriously flawed, or (B) the facts upon which the assertion is based is inconsistent with the logic underlying the assertion. Credibility as used in this context refers to the reliability of the statement based on the logic and facts that are offered by the applicant to support the assertion of utility. A *credible* utility is assessed from the standpoint of whether a person of ordinary skill in the art would accept that the recited or disclosed invention is currently available for such use. For example, no perpetual motion machines would be considered to be currently available. However, nucleic acids could be used as probes, chromosome markers, or forensic or diagnostic markers. Therefore, the credibility of such an assertion would not be questioned, although such a use might fail the *specific* and *substantial* tests (see below).

"Specific Utility" - A utility that is *specific* to the subject matter claimed. This contrasts with a *general* utility that would be applicable to the broad class of the invention. For example, a claim to a polynucleotide whose use is disclosed simply as a "gene probe" or "chromosome marker" would not be considered to be *specific* in the absence of a disclosure of a specific DNA target. Similarly, a general statement of diagnostic utility, such as diagnosing an unspecified disease, would ordinarily be insufficient absent a disclosure of what condition can be diagnosed.

"Substantial utility" - a utility that defines a "real world" use. Utilities that require or constitute carrying out further research to identify or reasonably confirm a "real world" context of use are not substantial utilities. For example, both a therapeutic method of treating a known or newly discovered disease and an assay method for identifying compounds that themselves have a "substantial utility" define a "real world" context of use. An assay that measures the presence of a material which has a stated correlation to a predisposition to the onset of a particular disease condition would also define a "real world" context of use in identifying potential candidates for preventive measures or further monitoring. On the other hand, the following are examples of situations that require or constitute carrying out further research to identify or reasonably confirm a "real world" context of use and, therefore, do not define "substantial utilities":

Art Unit: 1632

A. Basic research such as studying the properties of the claimed product itself or the mechanisms in which the material is involved.

B. A method of treating an unspecified disease or condition. (Note, this is in contrast to the general rule that treatments of specific diseases or conditions meet the criteria of 35 U.S.C. 101.)

C. A Method of assaying for or identifying a material that itself has no "specific and/or substantial utility".

D. A method of making a material that itself has no specific, substantial, and credible utility.

E. A claim to an intermediate product for use in making a final product that has no specific, substantial, and credible utility.

Note that "throw away" utilities do not meet the tests for a *specific* or *substantial* utility. For example, using transgenic mice as snake food is a utility that is neither specific (all mice could function as snake food) nor substantial (using a mouse costing tens of thousands of dollars to produce as snake food is not a "real world" context of use). Similarly, use of any protein as an animal food supplement or a shampoo ingredient are "throw away" utilities that would not pass muster as specific or substantial utilities under 35 U.S.C. ' 101. This analysis should, of course, be tempered by consideration of the context and nature of the invention. For example, if a transgenic mouse was generated with the specific provision of an enhanced nutrient profile, and disclosed for use as an animal food, then the test for specific and substantial *asserted* utility would be considered to be met.

"Well established utility" - a specific, substantial, and credible utility which is well known, immediately apparent, or implied by the specification's disclosure of the properties of a material, alone or taken with the knowledge of one skilled in the art. "Well established utility" does not encompass any "throw away" utility that one can dream up for an invention or a nonspecific utility that would apply to virtually every member of a general class of materials, such as proteins or DNA. If this is the case, any product or apparatus, including perpetual motion machines, would have a "well established utility" as landfill, an amusement device, a toy, or a paper weight; any carbon containing molecule would have a "well established utility" as a fuel since it can be burned; any protein would have well established utility as a protein supplement for animal food. This is not the intention of the statute.

See also the MPEP § 2107 - 2107.02.

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention lacks patentable utility due to its not being not supported by either a specific and/or substantial utility or a well established utility.

The claimed genetically engineered mammalian cell lines which have been mutated by a process comprising the insertion of a recombinantly manipulated polynucleotide sequence into a gene, said gene corresponding to SEQ ID NO: 125, and isolated murine embryonic stem cell lines comprising an engineered retroviral gene trap vector in at least one gene comprising a polynucleotide sequence disclosed in SEQ ID NO: 125, are not supported by a specific asserted utility because the disclosed uses of the cell lines are not specific, and are generally applicable to any cell comprising any nucleic acid. The specification states that the cells may be useful to generate a transgenic animal [see pp. 5-6; bridging ¶ of the specification], however, this is a non-specific use that is applicable to any embryonic stem cell, and not particular nor specific to the embryonic stem cell being claimed.

Furthermore, the claimed cells and embryonic stem cell is not supported by a substantial utility because no substantial utility has been established for the claimed subject matter. For example, the stem cell could be used to generate a transgenic animal, and the resulting transgenic animal could be studied to see the effect of the introduced mutation. The need for such research clearly indicates that



Art Unit: 1632

the claimed cell is not disclosed as to a currently available or substantial utility. A starting material that can only be used to produce a final product does not have substantial asserted utility in those instances where the final product is not supported by a specific and substantial utility. In the instant case, none of the cells or transgenic animals that are to be produced as final products have asserted or identified specific and substantial utilities. Identifying and studying the properties of an embryonic stem cell or transgenic animal does not define a "real world" context or use. Note, because the claimed invention is not supported by a specific and substantial asserted utility for the reasons set forth above, credibility has not been assessed. Neither the specification as filed, nor any art of record discloses or suggests any property or activity for the claimed embryonic stem cells such that another non-asserted utility would be well-established.

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-7 are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. Specifically, since the claimed invention is not supported by either a specific or substantial asserted utility or a well established utility for the reasons set forth above, one skilled in the art clearly would not know how to use the claimed invention.

Note further, that with regard to claims 3 and 7, directed to murine embryonic stem cell lines, the specification is not enabling for the claimed invention because the claims are directed to “murine” ES cells. The term “murine” as defined by Merriam-Webster’s dictionary is, “of or relating to a murid genus or its subfamily which includes the common household rats and mice.” However, the specification is not enabling for murine ES cells for the breadth claimed. This is because the state of the art is such that ES cell technology is generally limited to the mouse system at present, and that only “putative” ES cells exist for other species (see Moreadith *et al.*, J. Mol. Med., 1997, p. 214, *Summary*). Note that “putative” ES cells lack a demonstration of the cell to give rise to germline tissue or the whole animal, a demonstration which is an art-recognized property of ES cells. Moreadith *et al.* supports this observation as they discuss the historical perspective of mouse ES cells as follows:

“The stage was set one could grow normal, diploid ES cells in culture for multiple passages without loss of the ability to contribute to normal development. Furthermore, the cells contributed to the development of gametes at a high frequency (germline competence) and the haploid genomes of these cells were transmitted to the next generation. Thus, the introduction of mutations in these cells offered the possibility of producing mice with a predetermined genotype.”

Such a demonstration has not been provided by the specification or the prior or post-filing art with regard to the generation of any species of animal ES cells,

other than the mouse, which can give rise to the germline tissue of a developing animal. In addition, prior to the time of filing, Mullins *et al.* (*Journal of Clinical Investigation*, 1996) report that “although to date chimeric animals have been generated from several species including the pig, in no species other than the mouse has germline transmission of an ES cell been successfully demonstrated.” (page 1558, column 2, first ¶). As the claims are drawn to methods involving the manipulation of animal embryonic stem (ES), and particularly since the subject matter of the specification and the claimed invention encompasses the use of such cells for the generation of a transgenic animal, the state of the art supports that only mouse ES cells were available for use for production of transgenic mice.

This is further supported by Pera *et al.* [*Journal of Cell Science* 113: 5-10 (2000)] who present the generic criteria for pluripotent ES or EG cells [see p. 6, 2<sup>nd</sup> column] and state that, “Thus far, only mouse EG or ES cells meet these generic criteria. Primate ES cells meet the first three of the four criteria, but not the last. Numerous other candidate mammalian ES cells have been described over the years in domestic and laboratory species, but only in the mouse have all criteria been met rigorously.” [See p. 6, 2<sup>nd</sup> column, last ¶]. The specification fails to provide teachings or guidance for any other ES cells other than from mice.

Accordingly, in view of the quantity of experimentation necessary to produce ES cells from species other than mouse, the undeveloped and unpredictable state of the ES cell art, as well as the lack of teachings or guidance provided by the

specification for the production of ES cells from species other than mouse, it would have required undue experimentation for one skilled in the art to make and/or use the claimed invention.

Claim 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. This is a written description rejection.

*Vas-Cath Inc. v. Mahurkar*, 19USPQ2d 1111 (Fed. Cir. 1991), clearly states that “applicant must convey with reasonable clarity to those skilled in the art that, as of the filing date sought, he or she was in possession *of the invention*. The invention is, for purposes of the ‘written description’ inquiry, *whatever is now claimed*.” *Vas-Cath Inc. v. Mahurkar*, 19USPQ2d at 1117. The specification does not “clearly allow persons of ordinary skill in the art to recognize that [he or she] invented what is claimed. *Vas-Cath Inc. v. Mahurkar*, 19USPQ2d at 1116.

The claimed invention as a whole is not adequately described if the claims require essential or critical elements which are not adequately described in the specification and which are not conventional in the art **as of Applicants effective filing date**. Possession may be shown by actual reduction to practice, clear depiction of the invention in a detailed drawing, or by describing the invention with sufficient

relevant identifying characteristics (as it relates to the claimed invention as a whole) such that a person skilled in the art would recognize that the inventor had possession of the claimed invention. Pfaff v. Wells Electronics, Inc., 48 USPQ2d 1641, 1646 (1998). Adequate written description requires more than a mere statement that it is part of the invention and reference to a potential method of isolating it. See *Fiers v. Revel*, 25 USPQ2d 1601, 1606 (Fed. Cir. 1993) and *Amgen Inc. v. Chugai Pharmaceutical Co. Ltd.*, 18 USPQ2d 1016 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

The specification discloses that SEQ ID Nos: 1-154 correspond to murine cDNA sequences. As it is not apparent that SEQ ID NO: 125 is a complete cDNA sequence, the claims read on all cells that have a disruption of a gene which is encoded by an undescribed sequence. Additionally, it is noted that SEQ ID NO: 125 is 414 nucleotides in length and contains at least 3 wild cards or unspecified nucleotides. Given the multiplicity of sequences encompassed by SEQ ID NO: 125, the specification does not describe what the actual sequence Applicants' cells or ES cell(s) possess, nor have they identified the particular gene associated with those DNA fragments. One of ordinary skill in the art would not know what actual sequence was present in the ES cells produced by Applicant. Many, if not most, of the sequences encompassed may not be real sequences corresponding to real genes. The claims require that one of ordinary skill in the art produce murine ES cell lines, which comprises a disruption of a gene whose sequence may not exist in nature.

The skilled artisan cannot envision the detailed chemical structures of all the sequences encompassed by the above noted SEQ ID No: 125.

One cannot describe what one has not conceived. See *Fiddes v. Baird*, 30 USPQ2d 1481, 1483. In *Fiddes*, claims directed to mammalian FGF's were found to be unpatentable due to lack of written description for that broad class. The specification provided only the bovine sequence.

Applicant is reminded that *Vas-Cath* makes clear that the written description provision of 35 U.S.C. §112 is severable from its enablement provision (see page 1115).

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112*

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The claim recites that the murine embryonic stem cell line comprises "at least one gene comprising a polynucleotide sequence" [see lines 1-2 of the claim]. It is unclear if there is more than one gene encoded by the polynucleotide sequence, of that there is more than one polynucleotide sequence disclosed in SEQ ID NO: 125.

Art Unit: 1632

*Conclusion*

No claim is allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thaian N. Ton whose telephone number is (703) 305-1019. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 to 5:00 (Eastern Standard Time), with alternating Fridays off. Should the examiner be unavailable, inquiries should be directed to Deborah Reynolds, Supervisory Primary Examiner of Art Unit 1632, at (703) 305-4051. Any administrative or procedural questions should be directed to William Phillips, Patent Analyst, at (703) 305-3482. Papers related to this application may be submitted to Group 1600 by facsimile transmission. Papers should be faxed to Group 1600 via the PTO Fax Center located in Crystal Mall 1. The faxing of such papers must conform with the notice published in the Official Gazette, 1096 OG 30 (November 15, 1989). The CM1 Fax Center number is (703) 872-9306.

*Deborah Crouch*

TNT

Thaian N. Ton  
Patent Examiner  
Group 1632

DEBORAH CROUCH  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
GROUP 1600/630